SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS.

Rs. 5000 under "25—Public Health—A. 3—Rural Sanitation—Charges for the prevention of Epidemics".

Dr. A. R. Poduval *(Director of Public Health and Panchayats)*.—Sir, I rise to move for a supplementary grant of Rs. 5,000 under '25—Public Health—A. 3. Rural Sanitation—Charges for the prevention of Epidemics'. In the statement placed on the table of the Hon'ble Members you will find the details about this. The allotment for the current year under '25—Public Health-Charges for prevention of Epidemics' is only Rs. 1,500. Owing to the out-break of plague in Mattancheri and of small-pox in Urakam, Cherp, etc., villages, special staff had to be appointed, and medicines, etc. got down. The details of the expenditure to be incurred are given in the statement itself. It is further stated there that savings are not available to meet this expenditure. Hence an additional grant of Rs. 5,000 has become necessary under the above head. This demand could not be placed before the Standing Finance Committee as the proposals for the supplementary grant could be made only late.

Dr. A. R. Menon *(Pallippuram)*.—Is there plague now in Cochin?

Dr. A. R. Poduval *(Director of Public Health and Panchayats)*.—We occasionally find rat falls there.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Wadakkancheri)*.—Sir, I would like to have a ruling whether this supplementary grant placed before the House is in order inasmuch as it has not been placed before the Standing Finance Committee for its scrutiny. The reason given is that it could not be placed before the Standing Finance Committee. The Standing Finance Committee members were all present here in Council. They could have been summoned and the matter placed before them. It was the correct thing to do. So that I do not find any justification for the Government now to come forward and say that this matter could not be placed before the Standing Finance Committee in time.

Mr. President.—So far as the point of order is concerned it is the duty of the Hon'ble Member to point out under what Rule or Standing Order he demands a ruling.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Wadakkancheri).*— I am not able, Sir, to place my fingures on the particular provision in our enactment just at present. But there is a provision in the Standing Orders and there is also a ruling to the effect in this Council that all demands should be placed before the Standing Finance Committee before they are brought into the Council.

Mr. President.—I do not think the point of order will arise. Ordinarily, of course, Government place everything before the Standing Finance Committee. But in this particular case the Director says that this demand could not be placed before the Committee since the proposals for the supplementary grant could be made only late. The explanation might not have been satisfactory. As President I cannot say that it is out of order. The motion is in order.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Wadakkancheri).*— I oppose for the simple reason that it is not an urgent matter or that the grant is not for an urgent purpose or that if this is not allowed there will be any difficulty for Government to find funds to meet this item of expenditure; for you can certify the expenditure; but our point here is that our rights shall not be infringed especially when you are in the Chair. My point therefore is that this motion for supplementary grant cannot be allowed and for that reason I oppose it.

Mr. President.—It is because I wanted to safeguard the rights of this House that this motion is before the House. The previous practice so far has been that whenever it is not possible for any departmental head to send his demands for supplementary grant in time to be placed before the Standing Finance Committee the Diwan under section 16 (9) allows the grant and then simply reports to the Council. This also came exactly in that manner. I thought that even though there might not have been a chance for this demand to be placed before the Standing Finance Committee it is by far better to place it before the Council than the Diwan sanctioning it. I thought it was a better way of safeguarding the rights of this House and if the Hon'ble Member thinks it otherwise let him say we do not agree.

I may also give for the information of Hon'ble Members that as a result of this instance a circular is now issued to all departmental heads that in future they must be careful to see that they send their demands for supplementary grants in time to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

enable Government to place it before the Standing Finance Committee. (Hear, hear). I find there is considerable slackness in that behalf.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Wadakkancheri).*—In view of that statement of the Diwan I take this occasion to thank the Diwan and request him with the permission of the House to allow me to withdraw my opposition.

Dr. A. R. Poduval *(Director of Public Health and Panchayats).*—Sir, the exact period for which the plague staff has been asked to work was not settled, it has been continued and the exact amount required for salaries and for getting down of stores, etc., was known only very lately and this delay in submitting the demand is due to that.

Mr. President.—The departmental heads whenever they require additional grants should make their proposals sufficiently early so that Government may be able to place them before the Standing Finance Committee. I suppose they have to make estimates of expenditure before hand.

Grant was put and carried.

The Cochin Newspaper Act Repeal Bill (contd).

Mr. President.—We shall resume the discussion on the Cochin Newspaper Act Repeal Bill.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar *(Secretary to Government).*—Yesterday I was attempting to show how the provisions of this Bill which is now sought to be repealed have been worked in practice during the short time of two years now since this Act has been in force. I was dealing with section 3 which says that before a newspaper is published it has to take out a license paying a license fee. The fee as I submitted yesterday ranges from Re. 1 to Rs. 500. The fee that has been levied during these 3 years has been invariably, if I may so term it, nominal. The fee levied in many cases, in fact in almost all cases, is Rs. 10. In very many cases it is Rs. 5 and in some even Re. 1. In one case it is Rs. 100 and in another the maximum fee of Rs. 500 was levied. It will thus be seen, Sir, that in the actual working of this Act, the Government, though it has got the power under the Act to levy the maximum, has been exercising that power in the most sympathetic manner, in the most lenient manner possible so far as that section which makes it obligatory upon publishers to take out the license is concerned. Now having

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly